arXiv:1406.0222v1 [math.DG] 2 Jun 2014

SMOOTH APPROXIMATION OF CONIC KÄHLER METRIC WITH LOWER RICCI CURVATURE BOUND

LIANGMING SHEN

Abstract. We apply methods in [17] to prove that a conic Kähler metric with lower Ricci curvature bound can be approximated by smooth Kähler metrics with the same lower Ricci curvature bound. Furthermore, conic singularities here can be along a simple normal crossing divisor.

1. introduction

Recently, a very important progress has been made on Kahler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds (See [17][4] [5][6]). The main tool is an extension of Cheeger-Colding-Tian theory [3] to conic Kahler-Einstein metrics. This extension allows one to establish partial C^0-estimate which is known for long to be crucial in proving the existence of Kahler-Einstein metrics. To extend Cheeger-Colding-Tian theory from smooth case to conic case, in [17], Tian proved a sharp approximation theorem: any conic Kahler-Einstein metric can be approximated by smooth Kahler metrics with the same lower Ricci curvature bound in the Cheeger-Gromov sense.

The main idea for proving this sharp approximation came from [15], which gives a method of proving the equivalence of C^0-estimate and the properness of the Lagrangian of corresponding complex Monge-Ampere equation. Let's describe this in more details. First, we can define so called twisted Ding energy $F_\omega(\varphi)$ or twisted Mabuchi energy $\nu_\omega(\varphi)$ as [10], which are Lagrangians of corresponding complex Monge-Ampere equation, for the conic Kähler-Einstein metric. Then we can prove these two energies are both proper with respect to the functional $J_\omega(\varphi)$. After that, we perturb this singular complex Monge-Ampere equation, and prove that corresponding energies are also proper after such perturbation. Then, we make use of C^0-estimate in [16] to get a new C^0-estimate for perturbed complex Monge-Ampere equation. Finally, according to compactness theorem, we can prove that perturbed Kähler metrics converge to the original conic Kähler-Einstein metric in Cheeger-Gromov sense, and converge smoothly in C^∞ sense outside the divisor.

Now a more general problem is to understand the structures of Kähler manifolds with lower Ricci curvature bound. A natural question is whether we can also approximate arbitrary conic Kähler metric by smooth Kähler metrics with the same

lower Ricci curvature bound. We observe that the method above in [17] can apply if we can get suitbale complex Monge-Ampere equations and define suitable energies-for them. Moreover, instead of multiple anti-canonical divisors in the original proof, we can generalize our result to simple normal crossing divisors. A divisor D is called a simple normal crossing divisor if it can be written as

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^{m} D_i,$$

where each D_i is an irreducible divisor, and they cross only in a transversal way. At each point $p \in D$, it lies in the intersection of k divisors, say $D_1, \cdots, D_k$, and in the local coordinate neighborhood U we can write $D_i = z_i = 0$. Assume that our conic Kähler metric ω on the Kähler manifold M takes an angle $2\pi\beta_i$ along each D_i, where $0 < \beta_i < 1$, then near the point $p \in D$, the metric ω is asymptotically equivalent to the model conic metric

$$\omega_{0,p} = \sqrt{-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i}{|z_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}} + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i\right).$$

We say a smooth Kähler metric ω_0 on M has a lower Ricci curvature bound μ if there exists a nonnegative $(1,1)-$form Ω_0 such that

$$Ric(\omega_0) = \mu\omega_0 + \Omega_0. \tag{1.1}$$

And we say our conic Kähler metric ω has a lower Ricci curvature bound μ if there exists a nonnegative $(1,1)-$form Ω such that (we may assume that $\Omega \neq 0$ otherwise we come back to conic KählerEinstein case.)

$$Ric(\omega) = \mu\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2\pi(1-\beta_i)[D_i] + \Omega. \tag{1.2}$$

This equation is in the sense of currents on M and in classic sense outside singular part D. Consider these equations and apply Tian [17]'s methods for conic Kähler-Einstein metrics, we can prove our main theorem as below:

Theorem 1.1. *For Kähler manifold (M, D) where D is a simplenormal crossing divisor, assume that we have a smooth Kähler metric ω_0 and a conic Kähler metrics $\omega = \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$ with cone angle $2\pi\beta_i$ $(0 < \beta_i < 1, 1 \leq i \leq m)$ along each irreducible component D_i of D and φ is a smooth real function on $M \setminus D$. If both of them have the same lower Ricci curvature bound μ, then for any $\delta > 0$, there exsits a smooth Kähler metric ω_δ with the same lower Ricci curvature bound μ which converges to ω in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology on M and in the smooth topology outside D as δ tends to 0.*

Note that here we can deal with all the cases for μ. However, by Aubin and Yau, the cases $\mu < 0$ and $\mu = 0$ are easy to handle. The difficulty will be when $\mu > 0$, i.e.

Fano case. In the following section, we set up the complex Monge-Ampere equations and perturb it, and derive C^0-estimate for nonpositive μ. And we will deal with the case $\mu > 0$ in the remaining parts of this paper.

Acknowledgment. First the author wants to thank his Ph.D thesis advisor Professor Gang Tian for a lot of discussions and encouragement. And he also wants to thank Dr. Chi Li for many useful conversations. And he also thanks CSC for partial financial support during his Ph.D career.

2. BASIC SET UP AND THE CASE $\mu \leq 0$

First, comparing equations (1.1)(1.2), we have

$$\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_0^n} = -\mu\varphi + \Omega_0 - \Omega - \sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-\beta_i)(R(||\cdot||_i) + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log||S_i||_i^2),$$

where $\omega = \omega_0 + \varphi$ is the conic Kähler metric. As each D_i is an irreducible positive divisor, we set S_i as its defining holomorphic section, with $(||\cdot||_i)$ as the Hermitian product on the associated line bundle $[D_i]$, and the curvature of this bundle is defined as $R(||\cdot||_i) := -\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log||\cdot||_i^2$. Then we get the equation above just from Poincaré-Lelong equation

$$2\pi[D] = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log|S|^2 = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log||S||^2 + R(||\cdot||).$$

Note that the left handside of (1.1)(1.2) lie both in the cohomology class $c_1(M)$, we deduce that

$$\Omega_0 - \Omega - \sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-\beta_i)(R(||\cdot||_i) = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}h_0. \tag{2.1}$$

where h_0 is a smooth function on M and we note that $\frac{1}{2\pi}R(||\cdot||_i)$ represents $c_1(D_i)$. Then we get our complex Monge-Ampere equation:

$$(\omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi)^n = e^{h_0 - \mu\varphi - \sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-\beta_i)\log||S_i||_i^2 + c}\omega_0^n, \tag{2.2}$$

where the constant c is chosen so that

$$\int_M (e^{h_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-\beta_i)\log||S_i||_i^2 + c} - 1)\omega_0^n = 0.$$

As [17], we can choose such an approximation equation:

$$(\omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi)^n = e^{h_\delta - \mu\varphi}\omega_0^n, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$h_\delta = h_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{m}(1-\beta_i)\log(\delta + ||S_i||_i^2) + c_\delta$$

and the constant c_δ is chosen such that

$$\int_M (e^{h_0-\sum_{i=1}^m(1-\beta_i)\log(\delta+||S_i||_i^2)+c_\delta}-1)\omega_0^n=0.$$

Here c_δ is uniformly bounded. If we have a solution φ_δ for (2.3), then we get a smooth Kähler metric $\omega_\delta=\omega_0+\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi_\delta$ with Ricci curvature as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
Ric(\omega_\delta)=&Ric(\omega_0)+\mu\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi_\delta-\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial h_\delta\\
=&\mu\omega_0+\Omega_0+\mu\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi_\delta-\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial h_0+\sum_{i=1}^m(1-\beta_i)\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\log(\delta+||S_i||_i^2)\\
=&\mu\omega_\delta+\Omega+\sum_{i=1}^m(1-\beta_i)(R(||\cdot||_i)+\frac{||S_i||_i^2}{\delta+||S_i||_i^2}\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\log||S_i||_i^2\\
&+\frac{\delta DS_i\wedge\overline{DS_i}}{(\delta+||S_i||_i^2)^2})\\
=&\mu\omega_\delta+\Omega+\sum_{i=1}^m(1-\beta_i)(\frac{\delta}{\delta+||S_i||_i^2}R(||\cdot||_i)+\frac{\delta DS_i\wedge\overline{DS_i}}{(\delta+||S_i||_i^2)^2}),
\end{aligned}$$

note that $||S_i||_i^2\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\log|S_i|_i^2=||S_i||_i^2\cdot 2\pi[D_i]=0$. We can see that if we have a solution φ_δ for small $\delta>0$, the Ricci curvature of ω_δ is always greater than μ.

By the computation above, we have a corollary which asserts the openness of the solvable set for the continuity path below:

Lemma 2.1. *Consider the continuity path of the equation* (2.3)

$$(\omega_0+\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi)^n=e^{h_\delta-t\varphi}\omega_0^n, \tag{2.4}$$

and set the interval I_δ as its solvable interval, then $0\in I_\delta$ and this interval is open.

Proof. $0\in I_\delta$ follows from Calabi-Yau theorem. By the computation above and [17], it's easy to have $\lambda_1(-\Delta_t)$ is strictly larger than t. Then the openness of I_δ follows. □

So now, to solve the equation (2.3), we need to set up C^0-estimate for φ_δ. We first consider the cases that $\mu=0$ and $\mu<0$. Actually by Calabi-Yau Theorem and Aubin's work (see [18]), we can get C^0-estimates for these cases. The main difficulty lies in the case $\mu>0$, which we will deal with in the following sections.

3. twisted functionals for complex monge-ampere equations, bounded from below

Following [7][15][10], we can still define corresponding functionals for our complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.2). First, we define generalized energy functionals as below:

Definition 3.1.

$$(1)J_{\omega_0}(\varphi)=\frac{1}{V}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{i+1}{n+1}\int_M\sqrt{-1}\partial\varphi\wedge\bar{\partial}\varphi\wedge\omega_0^i\wedge\omega_\varphi^{n-i-1},$$

$$(2)I_{\omega_0}(\varphi)=\frac{1}{V}\int_M\varphi(\omega_0^n-\omega_\varphi^n),$$

where $V=\int_M\omega_0^n$, $\omega_\varphi=\omega_0+\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$.

Note that these functionals are well defined even in conic case. It's easy to check that

$$0\leq\frac{n+1}{n}J_{\omega_0}(\varphi)\leq I_{\omega_0}(\varphi)\leq(n+1)J_{\omega_0}(\varphi).$$

Next let's define two functionals which are both Lagrangians of the equation (2.2). For simplicity here we set

$$H_0=h_0-\sum_{i=1}^m(1-\beta_i)\log||S_i||_i^2+c,$$

and we can choose a family φ_t connected 0 and φ

Definition 3.2. (1) We define twisted Ding functional as

$$F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\varphi)=J_{\omega_0}(\varphi)-\frac{1}{V}\int_M\varphi\omega_0^n-\frac{1}{\mu}\log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{H_0-\mu\varphi}\omega_0^n\right),\tag{3.1}$$

(2) we define twisted Mabuchi functional as

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\omega_0,\mu}(\varphi)=&-\frac{n}{V}\int_0^1\int_M\dot{\varphi}(Ric(\omega_\varphi)-\mu\omega_\varphi-\sum_{i=1}^m2\pi(1-\beta_i)[D_i]-\Omega\wedge\omega_\varphi^{n-1})dt\\=&\frac{1}{V}\int_M\log\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n}\omega_\varphi^n+\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega_0^n-\omega_\varphi^n)-\mu(I_{\omega_0}(\varphi)-J_{\omega_0}(\varphi))\\=&\frac{1}{V}\int_M\log\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n}\omega_\varphi^n+\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega_0^n-\omega_\varphi^n)+\mu(F_{\omega_0}^0(\varphi)+\frac{1}{V}\int_M\varphi\omega_\varphi^n),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_{\omega_0}^0(\varphi)=J_{\omega_0}(\varphi)-\frac{1}{V}\int_M\varphi\omega_0^n.$$

These definitions are similar to smooth case [16] and conic Kähler-Einstein case [10]. We can check that they are well defined for conic case. From [16][10], we know that to get C^0-estimate for φ_δ, we need to prove the corresponding twisted Ding functional is proper with respect to the generalized energy $J_{\omega_0}(\varphi)$. Now let's recall the definition of properness:

Definition 3.3. Suppose the twisted Ding functional $F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$(twisted Mabuchi functional $\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$) is bounded from below, i.e. $F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq -c_\omega$ ($\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\varphi) \geq -c_\omega$), we say it is proper on $P_c(M,\omega)$, if there exists an increasing function $f : [-c_\omega, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, and $\lim_{t\to\infty} f(t) = \infty$, such that for any $\phi \in P_c(M,\omega)$, we have

$$F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq f(J_\omega(\phi)) \quad (\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq f(J_\omega(\phi))),$$

where $\phi \in P_c(M,\omega)$ is a smooth function on $M \setminus D$ such that $\omega_\phi = \omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ is a conic metric with the prescribed angles along each component of D.

There are a lot of properties for these functionals, which are parallel to [16][9][10]. First We just put two basic facts here and the proofs are in [16][10]:

Proposition 3.4. *(1)Given a path $\{\phi_t\}$ in $P_c(M,\omega)$, we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt}J_\omega(\phi_t) = -\frac{1}{V}\int_M \dot{\phi}_t(\omega_\phi^n - \omega^n),$$
$$\frac{d}{dt}F^0_\omega(\phi_t) = -\frac{1}{V}\int_M \dot{\phi}_t\omega_\phi^n,$$

(2)$F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$, $F^0_\omega(\phi)$ and $\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$ satisfy the cocycle condition:

$$F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + F_{\omega_\phi,\mu}(\psi - \phi) = F_{\omega,\mu}(\psi),$$
$$F^0_\omega(\phi) + F^0_{\omega_\phi}(\psi - \phi) = F^0_\omega(\psi),$$
$$\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + \nu_{\omega_\phi,\mu}(\psi - \phi) = \nu_{\omega,\mu}(\psi),$$

We note that in (2), the last two follow directly from differentiation. For $F_{\omega_\phi,\mu}$, we need to choose corresponding function h_ϕ parallel to h_0 in the equation (2.1). Whatever ω_ϕ is smooth or conic along D, we can write $Ric(\omega_\phi) = \mu\omega_\varphi + \Omega_\phi$ or $Ric(\omega_\phi) = \mu\omega_\phi + \sum_{i=1}^k 2\pi(1-\beta_i)[D_i] + \Omega_\phi$, where Ω_ϕ is not necessarily nonnegative. Then all the arguments in smooth case will apply.
From (1) we have a useful corollary:

Corollary 3.5. *For $0 < t < 1$, we have*

$$J_\omega(t\phi) \leq t^{\frac{n+1}{n}} J_\omega(\phi).$$

Proof. Consider the path $\{t\phi\}_{0\leq t\leq 1}$, then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}J_\omega(t\phi) = -\frac{1}{V}\int_M \phi(\omega_{t\phi}^n - \omega^n) = \frac{I_\omega(t\phi)}{t} \geq \frac{n+1}{n}\frac{J_\omega(t\phi)}{t},$$

integrate this inequality then the corollary follows. □

Now we discuss some relations among these functionals and their behaviors under different background metrics. First we have a lemma on the generalized energy J_ω, and see [10] for its proof:

Lemma 3.6. *suppose $\omega_2 = \omega_1 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$, then for any $\phi \in P_c(M,\omega_1) \cap P_c(M,\omega_2)$, we have*

$$|J_{\omega_1}(\phi) - J_{\omega_2}(\phi)| \leq C(\omega_1, \omega_2).$$

From this lemma and the cocycle property of $F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi), \nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$, we observe that the properties of bounded from below and properness are independent of the choice of metrics in the same Kähler class.
Next we want to know the relation between $F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi), \nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi)$. We want to prove that these two properties of the two functionals are actually equivalent. Actually these are similar to the proofs by Berman [1] and Li-Sun [10], and we'd like to use the proof in [9]:

Lemma 3.7. *(1)there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq \mu F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) - C,$$

(2)suppose ψ solves $\omega_\psi^n = e^{H_0 - \mu\phi}$ by Calabi-Yau theorem, then we have

$$\mu F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega^n \geq \nu_{\omega,\mu}(\psi),$$

In particular, by (1)(2) we know that $F_{\omega,\mu}$ is bounded from below is equivalent to that $\nu_{\omega,\mu}$ is bounded from below,
(3)in case that $\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq C_1 J_\omega(\phi) - C_2$ where $C_1, C_2 > 0$, there exist constants $c, C' > 0$ such that

$$F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) \geq c\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) - C'.$$

Proof. (1) We modify the expression of twisted Mabuchi functional in the definition as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) =& \frac{1}{V}\int_M \log\frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega^n}\omega_\phi^n + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega^n - \omega_\phi^n) + \mu(F_\omega^0(\phi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M \phi\omega_\phi^n) \\
=& \mu F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega^n + \frac{1}{V}\int_M \log\frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega^n}\omega_\phi^n - \frac{1}{V}\int_M (H_0 - \mu\phi)\omega_\phi^n \\
&+ \log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{H_0 - \mu\phi}\omega^n\right) \\
=& \mu F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega^n + \log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{H_0 - \mu\phi - \log\frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega^n}}\omega_\phi^n\right) \\
&- \frac{1}{V}\int_M (H_0 - \mu\phi - \log\frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega^n})\omega_\phi^n,
\end{aligned}$$

then(1) follows from the concavity of logarithm.
(2) Still make use of the defintion and cocycle property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\omega,\mu}(\psi) =&\frac{1}{V}\int_M \log\frac{\omega_\psi^n}{\omega^n}\omega_\psi^n + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega^n-\omega_\psi^n) + \mu(F_\omega^0(\psi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M \psi\omega_\psi^n)\\ =&\frac{1}{V}\int_M (H_0-\mu\phi)\omega_\psi^n + \frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega^n-\omega_\psi^n) + \mu(F_\omega^0(\psi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M \psi\omega_\psi^n)\\ =&\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega^n + \mu\left(F_\omega^0(\phi) - F_{\omega_\psi}^0(\phi-\psi) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M(\psi-\phi)\omega_\psi^n\right)\\ =&\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega^n + \mu\left(F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) + \log(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{H_0-\mu\phi}\omega^n) - J_{\omega_\psi}(\phi-\psi))\right),\end{aligned}$$

then (2) follows from that $e^{H_0-\mu\phi}\omega^n = \omega_\psi^n$ and $J_{\omega_\psi}(\phi-\psi)\geq 0$.
(3) From the assumption, we have a small $\delta>0$ such that $\nu_{\omega,\mu+\delta}(\phi) = \nu_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) - \delta(I-J)_\omega(\phi)$ is bounded from below, so is $F_{\omega,\mu+\delta}(\phi)$ by (2). Then we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\omega,\mu}(\phi) =&F_\omega^0(\phi) - \frac{\mu+\delta}{\mu}\frac{1}{\nu+\delta}\log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{H_0-(\mu+\delta)\frac{\mu}{\mu+\delta}\phi}\omega^n\right)\\ =&F_\omega^0(\phi) + \frac{\mu+\delta}{\mu}(F_{\omega,\mu+\delta}(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\delta}\phi) - F_\omega^0(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\delta}\phi))\\ \geq&J_\omega(\phi) - \frac{\mu+\delta}{\mu}J_\omega(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\delta}\phi) - C'\\ \geq&(1-(\frac{\mu}{\mu+\delta})^{\frac{1}{n}})J_\omega(\phi) - C',\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Corollary 3.5. □

To prove properness of the functionals in case of the existence of the conic metric $\omega=\omega_\varphi$, we need to verify that they are bounded from above:

Theorem 3.8. *If the singular Monge-Ampere equation* (2.2) *has a solution* φ, *i.e there exists a conic Kähler metric* $\omega_\varphi = \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi$ *satisfying the equation* (1.1), *then* φ *attains the minimum of the functional* $F_{\omega_0,\mu}$ *on the space* $P_c(M,\omega_0)$. *In particular* $F_{\omega_0,\mu}$ *is bounded from above.*

Proof. A parallel result is proved in [10], but we'd like to extend Ding-Tian's proof [7][15] to our conic case. Let's consider the continuity path of the complex Monge-Ampere equation:

$$(\omega_0+\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi_t)^n = e^{H_0-t\varphi_t}\omega_0^n. \tag{3.2}$$

Now we know that when $t=\mu$ this equation is solvable. Actually by [2], we know that it is also solvable when $t=0$. Now when $0<t<\mu$, by implicit function theorem, we need to consider whether the linearized operator of the (3.2), $\Delta_t + t$, is invertible. We know that in smooth case, by Bochner's formula, as $Ric(\omega_t) > t\omega_t$, it

is invertible and we can prove the openness of solvable set for t. However, in conic case, [8] gives a parallel result. By their argument, we have Δ_t as the Friedrichs extension of the Laplacian associated to $\omega_t = \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_t$ and $\lambda_1(-\Delta_t) > t$, so the openness is true. We can set $\{\varphi_t\}$ as a continuous family of solutions of (3.2), then we can do computations as [15] in a weak sense.
First take the derivative of (3.2) with respect to t, we have

$$\Delta_t\dot{\varphi}_t = -\varphi_t - t\dot{\varphi}_t,$$

where Δ_t is in a weak sense as [8]. As for all t, we have $\int_M e^{H_0 - t\varphi_t}\omega_0^n = V$, take the derivative with respect to t we get

$$\int_M (\varphi_t + t\dot{\varphi}_t)e^{H_0 - t\varphi_t}\omega_0^n = 0.$$

Now make use of the formulas in the beginning of this section, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}(I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t)) &= \frac{1}{V}\int_M \dot{\varphi}_t(\omega_0^n - \omega_t^n) - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t\Delta_t\dot{\varphi}_t\omega_t^n - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \dot{\varphi}_t(\omega_0^n - \omega_t^n) \\
&= \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t(\varphi_t + t\dot{\varphi}_t)\omega_t^n \\
&= -\frac{d}{dt}(\frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t e^{H_0 - t\varphi_t}\omega_0^n) + \frac{1}{V}\int_M \dot{\varphi}_t e^{H_0 - t\varphi_t}\omega_0^n \\
&= -\frac{d}{dt}(\frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t\omega_t^n) - \frac{1}{tV}\int_M \varphi_t\omega_t^n.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(t(I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t))\right) - (I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t)) = -\frac{d}{dt}(\frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t\omega_t^n), \tag{3.3}$$

Integrating this from 0 to t, we have

$$t(I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t)) - \int_0^t (I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_s) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_s))ds = -\frac{t}{V}\int_M \varphi_t\omega_t^n.$$

By the definition, it's just

$$-\int_0^t (I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_s) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_s))ds = t(J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t) - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_t\omega_0^n) = tF^0_{\omega_0}(\varphi_t). \tag{3.4}$$

As we have $\int_M e^{H_0 - \mu\varphi}\omega_0^n = V$, we derive that $F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\varphi) \leq 0$.
Now let's consider $\phi \in P_c(M, \omega_0)$. If $\omega_\phi = \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ is smooth, then we have

$$Ric(\omega_\phi) = \mu\omega_\varphi + \Omega_\phi,$$

where Ω_ϕ is not necessarily nonnegative. Compare it with (1.1), we have

$$(\omega_\phi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(\varphi - \phi))^n = e^{h_\phi - \mu(\varphi-\phi) - \sum_{i=1}^m (1-\beta_i)\log||S_i||_i^2 + c_\phi}\omega_\phi^n,$$

where we take $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}h_\phi = \Omega_\phi - \Omega - \sum_{i=1}^m (1-\beta_i)(R(||\cdot||_i)$. Then all the arguments are parallel and we have $F_{\omega_\phi,\mu}(\varphi-\phi) \leq 0$. Now let's consider the case when ω_ϕ is conic along D. Here we have the equation

$$Ric(\omega_\phi) = \mu\omega_\varphi + \sum_{i=1}^k 2\pi(1-\beta_i)[D_i] + \Omega_\phi.$$

Compare it with (1.1), we have

$$(\omega_\phi + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}(\varphi-\phi))^n = e^{h_\phi - \mu(\varphi-\phi)+c_\phi}\omega_\phi^n,$$

where we have $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}h_\phi = \Omega_\phi - \Omega$. In this case, all the arguments are similar to smooth case and we get the same conclusion. Now by cocycle condition, we have

$$F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) = F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\varphi) - F_{\omega_\phi,\mu}(\varphi-\phi) \geq F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\varphi).$$

This theorem is proved. □

4. log α-invariant, properness of twisted energies

We want to prove the properness of the twisted Ding energy. First we want to introduce log α-invariant, then let's see how to use this invariant to prove the properness of twisted Mabuchi energy in case that μ is small. Then make use of concavity of energies to prove the properness of energies in general case.
Recall that α-invariant in smooth case was introduced by Tian [12] in 1980s. In [1] [8] this invariant is generalized to conic case. We introduce so-called log α-invariant here, following [10]:

Definition 4.1. Fix a smooth volume form vol, for any Kähler class $[\omega]$, we define log α-invariant as below:

$$\alpha(\omega, D) = \sup\{\alpha > 0 : \exists C_\alpha < \infty \quad s.t. \quad \frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{\alpha(\sup\phi - \phi)}\frac{vol}{\prod_{i=1}^m |S_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}} \leq C_\alpha \quad for\ any\ \phi \in P_c(M,\omega)\}.$$

Berman [1] has an estimate for the positive lower bound of log α-invariant in conic case, i.e, there exists a positive number α_0 such that $\alpha(\omega, D) \geq \alpha_0 > 0$. Using this estimate, we can prove that the twisted Mabuchi energy is proper when μ is small enough:

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose $\alpha(\omega, D) \geq \alpha_0 > \frac{n}{n+1}\mu > 0$, then we have*

$$\nu_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C,$$

where ϵ, C are constants depending on α_0, μ.

Proof. Similar to [8] [10] [15], make use of logarithm property, for $\frac{n}{n+1}\mu < \alpha < \alpha_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\log C_\alpha &\geq \log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{\alpha(\sup\phi-\phi)}\frac{e^{H_0}\omega_0^n}{\prod_{i=1}^m |S_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}}\right)\\
&\geq \log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{\alpha(\sup\phi-\phi)-\log\frac{\prod_{i=1}^m |S_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}\omega_\phi^n}{\omega_0^n}+H_0}\omega_\phi^n\right)\\
&\geq \frac{1}{V}\int_M\left(H_0-\frac{\prod_{i=1}^m |S_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}\omega_\phi^n}{\omega_0^n}\right)\omega_\phi^n+\frac{\alpha}{V}\int_M(\sup\phi-\phi)\omega_\phi^n\\
&\geq \frac{1}{V}\int_M\left(H_0-\frac{\prod_{i=1}^m |S_i|^{2(1-\beta_i)}\omega_\phi^n}{\omega_0^n}\right)\omega_\phi^n+\alpha I_{\omega_0}(\phi).
\end{aligned}$$

By the defintion of twisted Mabuchi energy, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) &= \frac{1}{V}\int_M\log\frac{\omega_\phi^n}{\omega_0^n}\omega_\phi^n+\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0(\omega_0^n-\omega_\phi^n)-\mu(I_{\omega_0}(\phi)-J_{\omega_0}(\phi))\\
&\geq \log C_\alpha+\frac{1}{V}\int_M H_0\omega_0^n+\alpha I_{\omega_0}(\phi)-\mu(I_{\omega_0}(\phi)-J_{\omega_0}(\phi))\\
&\geq (\alpha-\frac{n}{n+1}\mu)I_{\omega_0}(\phi)-C\\
&\geq (\frac{n+1}{n}\alpha-\mu)J_{\omega_0}(\phi)-C.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished. □

As the equivalence of the properness of twisted Ding energy and Mabuchi energy, we have such a corollary very easily:

Corollary 4.3. *When $\alpha(\omega, D) \geq \alpha_0 > \frac{n}{n+1}\mu > 0$, we have*

$$F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C,$$

where ϵ, C are constants depending on α_0, μ.

Until now we only get the properness when μ is small enough. For general case, we need to apply continuity method and the concavity property of the energy which is shown below to increase μ. Here is a lemma which allows us to increase μ and see also in [10]:

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose $0 < \mu_0 < \mu_1$, write $\mu = (1-t)\mu_0 + t\mu_1$ where $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we have*

$$\mu F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) \geq (1-t)\mu_0 F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi) + t\mu_1 F_{\omega_0,\mu}(\phi).$$

Proof. It follows from the convexity of exponential functions. □

Now we can prove our main theorem in this section and similar results also appear in [10] [17]:

Theorem 4.5. *For $t \in (0, \mu]$ and any $\phi \in P_c(M, \omega_0)$there exist constants ϵ, C_ϵ such that*

$$F_{\omega_0,t}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C_\epsilon. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. We apply the continuity path similar to [8], i.e, the equation (3.2). In our case, we may assume that $\Omega \neq 0$. Then by [8], we have that $\lambda_1(-\Delta_t) > t$ for all $t \in (0, \mu]$, which allows us to prove the openness at $t = \mu$. So now when $\bar{\mu} = \mu + \delta$ where δ is very small, we have a solution $\bar{\varphi}$ for (3.2) where μ is replaced by $\bar{\mu}$. By theorem 3.8, $F_{\omega_0,\bar{\mu}}(\phi)$ is bounded from below. As we have the corollary above which asserts that when $t > 0$ is very small $F_{\omega_0,t}(\phi)$ is proper, by the lemma above, we know that for all $t \in (0, \mu]$ the twisted Ding energy is proper, i.e.

$$F_{\omega_0,t}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C_\epsilon. \tag{4.2}$$

We finish the proof. □

5. C^0-estimate for approximating solution: the case $\mu > 0$

Recall that in Section 2 we set up the approximating complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.3), which is expected to give us a smooth approximation of conic Kähler metric $\omega = \omega_0 + \varphi$. We also prove C^0-estimate for φ_δ when $\mu \leq 0$. In this section, we want to make use of the properness of corresponding Lagrangians to prove C^0-estimate when $\mu > 0$. Then the first step is to prove the properness of the new approximating twisted Ding energy, which can be deduced from the last section:

Lemma 5.1. *We introduce the new approximating twisted Ding energy as below:*

$$F_{\delta,t}(\varphi) = J_{\omega_0}(\varphi) - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega_0^n - \frac{1}{t}\log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{h_\delta - t\varphi}\omega_0^n\right), \tag{5.1}$$

which is the Lagrangian of the approximating complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.4) *in the continuity path. Then we have*

$$F_{\delta,t}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C(\epsilon, \delta, t)$$

.

Proof. In the end of last section, we proved that

$$F_{\omega_0,t}(\phi) \geq \epsilon J_{\omega_0}(\phi) - C_\epsilon.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_\delta &= h_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m (1-\beta_i)\log(\delta + ||S_i||_i^2) + c_\delta \\ &\leq h_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m (1-\beta_i)\log||S_i||_i^2 + c_\delta = H_0 - c + c_\delta, \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$F_{\delta,t}(\phi) \geq F_{\omega_0,t}(\phi) + \frac{c - c_\delta}{t},$$

and the lemma follows very easily. □

Now we will follow [15] to finish C^0-estimate for φ_δ. Similar to the equation (3.4), we have

$$-\int_0^t (I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,s}) - J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,s}))ds = t(J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t}) - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_0^n) = tF^0_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t}),$$

where $\varphi_{\delta,t}$ solves the equation (2.4). By this equation, we can estimate $F_{\delta,\mu}(\varphi_{\delta,t})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\delta,\mu}(\varphi_{\delta,t}) &= F^0_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t}) - \log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{h_\delta - \mu\varphi_{\delta,t}}\omega_0^n\right) \\ &\leq -\log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{h_\delta - t\varphi_{\delta,t} - (\mu-t)\varphi_{\delta,t}}\omega_0^n\right) \\ &= -\log\left(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{-(\mu-t)\varphi_{\delta,t}}\omega_{\delta,t}^n\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\mu - t}{\mu}\frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_{\delta,t}^n. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the estimate, we need a useful lemma as below:

Lemma 5.2. $||\varphi_{\delta,t}||_{C^0} \leq C(1 + J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t}))$.

Proof. First we note that $Ric(\omega_{\delta,t}) > t$, and the volume preserved. Then we have uniform Sobolev and Poincaré constants when t doesn't tend to 0. We observe that $n + \Delta_0\varphi_{\delta,t} > 0$, then we get

$$0 \leq \sup\varphi_{\delta,t} \leq \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_0^n + C$$

by Green's formula. On the other hand, we have $n - \Delta_{\delta,t}\varphi_{\delta,t} > 0$, by Moser's iteration, we have

$$-\inf\varphi_{\delta,t} \leq -\frac{C}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_{\delta,t}^n + C.$$

By normalization condition, $\varphi_{\delta,t}$ changes sign, we have

$$||\varphi_{\delta,t}||_{C^0} \leq \sup\varphi_{\delta,t} - \inf\varphi_{\delta,t} \leq C(1 + I_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t})) \leq C(1 + J_{\omega_0}(\varphi_{\delta,t})).$$

□

In the proof we have

$$0 \leq -\inf\varphi_{\delta,t} \leq -\frac{C}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_{\delta,t}^n + C,$$

then we have

$$\frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi_{\delta,t}\omega_{\delta,t}^n \leq C,$$

which gives $F_{\delta,\mu}(\varphi_{\delta,t}) \leq C$. Combine the two lemmas above, we conclude the C^0-estimate for φ_δ and get the following theorem:

Theorem 5.3. *For each $\delta > 0$, the approximating complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.3) has a unique smooth solution φ_δ, which gives us a smooth Kähler metric $\omega_\delta = \omega_0 + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_\delta$ such that $Ric(\omega_\delta) \geq \mu\omega_\delta$.*

6. convergence when δ tends to 0

In the last section we proved C^0-estimate for φ_δ. We also note that in the approximating complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.3), the constant c_δ is uniformly bounded. Then the constant $C(\epsilon, \delta, t)$ in Lemma 5.1 is uniform with respect to δ. According to this observation, we conclude that our C^0-estimate for φ_δ is uniform with respect to δ, i.e, $\sup|\varphi_\delta| \leq C_0$. Based on this, we can give C^2-estimate for φ_δ by generalized Schwarz Lemma first:

Lemma 6.1.

$$C_1\omega_0 \leq \omega_\delta \leq \frac{C_2\omega_0}{\prod_{i=1}^m(\delta + ||S_i||^2)^{(1-\beta_i)}}. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. First we have $\sup|\varphi_\delta| \leq C_0$ and $Ric(\omega_\delta) \geq \mu\omega_\delta$. Take Δ as the Laplacian for ω_δ and normal coordinate around a point p for ω_δ, i.e, $g_{i\bar{j}}(p) = \delta_{ij}, dg_{i\bar{j}}(p) = 0$. We may also take $g_{0i\bar{j}}(p) = g_{0i\bar{i}}\delta_{ij}$, i.e, diagonal for ω_0, then we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 &= g^{i\bar{i}}(g^{k\bar{l}}g_{0k\bar{l}})_{i\bar{i}} = g^{i\bar{i}}(g^{k\bar{k}})_{i\bar{i}}g_{0k\bar{k}} + g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}(g_{0k\bar{k}})_{i\bar{i}} \\
&= g^{i\bar{i}}R_{i\bar{i}}{}^{k\bar{k}}(g)g_{0k\bar{k}} - g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}(g_0) + g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}g^{l\bar{l}}(g_{0k\bar{l}})_i(g_{0l\bar{k}})_{\bar{i}} \\
&= R^{k\bar{k}}g_{0k\bar{k}} - g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}(g_0) + g_0^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}g^{l\bar{l}}(g_{0k\bar{l}})_i(g_{0l\bar{k}})_{\bar{i}} \\
&\geq -g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}(g_0) + g_0^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}g^{l\bar{l}}(g_{0k\bar{l}})_i(g_{0l\bar{k}})_{\bar{i}},
\end{aligned}$$

and the last inequality follows from $Ric(\omega_\delta) \geq \mu\omega_\delta$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\log tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 &= \frac{\Delta tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0}{tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0} - \frac{|\nabla tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0|^2}{|tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0|^2} \\
&\geq \frac{(tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0)g_0^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}g^{l\bar{l}}(g_{0k\bar{l}})_i(g_{0l\bar{k}})_{\bar{i}} - g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}g^{l\bar{l}}(g_{0k\bar{k}})_i(g_{0l\bar{l}})_{\bar{i}}}{|tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0|^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{g^{i\bar{i}}g^{k\bar{k}}R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}(g_0)}{tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0} \geq -atr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the bisectional curvature of ω_0 is less than a and the last inequality follows from $g_0^{i\bar{i}}tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 \geq g^{i\bar{i}}$. As we have $\sup|\varphi_\delta| \leq C_0$, we take $u = \log tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 - (a+1)\varphi_\delta$,

then we will have

$$\Delta u \geq tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 - n(a+1) = e^{u+n(a+1)} - n(a+1).$$

By maximal principle $u \leq C(a)$, and we then get $tr_{\omega_\delta}\omega_0 \leq C'$, which will give us that $C_1\omega_0 \leq \omega_\delta$. For the other side, make use of the complex Monge-Ampere equation (2.3) and the inequality we get, we can easily deduce that

$$\omega_\delta \leq \frac{C_2\omega_0}{\prod_{i=1}^m(\delta + ||S_i||^2)^{(1-\beta_i)}}.$$

□

From this lemma, by C^3-estimate in [18] (or see [15]) and regulairity theory we can prove that for any $l > 2$ and compact set $K \in M \setminus D$, there exists a uniform constant $C(l, K)$ such that we have high order estimate locally:

$$||\varphi_\delta|| \leq C(l, K). \tag{6.2}$$

As we have got all the estimates we need, we can prove the main theorem below, following [17]:

Theorem 6.2. *As δ tends to 0, the smooth Kähler metric ω_δ converge to the conic Kähler metric ω in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology on M and in the smooth topology outside the divisor D.*

Proof. In this proof, we first consider D as an irreducible divisor. As we have high order estimates (6.1) (6.2) outside the divisor D, it suffices to prove ω_δ converges to ω in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology. Note that for all ω_δ we have $Ric(\omega_\delta) \geq \mu, Vol(M, \omega_\delta) = V$, to apply compactness theorem (e.g. see Chap.10 in [11]), we only need to bound the diameter for all ω_δ. In case that $\mu > 0$ we can get it directly by Meyer's theorem. However, as we have the estimate (6.1), it's easy to control the length of arbitrary geodesics outside the divisor. And in the neighborhood of some irreducible divisor, say D, we make use of local coordinates and set $r = |z_1|$, where $\{z_1 = 0\}$ locally defines the divisor D. Now we know that $||S||$ here is almost r near the divisor and we consider the length of a short geodesic γ transverse to D that:

$$L(\gamma, \omega_\delta) \approx C\int_0^{r_0} \frac{dr}{(\delta + r^2)^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}}} \leq C\int_0^{r_0} \frac{dr}{r^{1-\beta}} \leq \frac{Cr_0^\beta}{\beta}.$$

Now by compactness theorem, without loss of generality, (M, ω_δ) converge to a length space $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$ in Gromov- Hausdorff topology. To prove the theorem we need to prove that $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$ coincides with (M, ω). As we have high order estimate (6.2) outside the divisor D, there exists an open set U in $\bar{M}$ which is equivalent to $M \setminus D$, and the equivalence $i : M \setminus D \to U$ induces an isometry between $(M \setminus D, \omega|_{M\setminus D}$ and $(U, \bar{d}.)$ Now we note that $M \setminus D$ is geodesically convex with respect to ω, i.e. any two points $p, q \in M \setminus D$, there exists a minimal geodesic $\gamma \subset M \setminus D$ joining them. Actually we only need to consider the case when p, q are in the small neighborhood

of $o \in D$. In this case we know that the metric ω is almost the standard conic metric around a point $o \in D$, which behaviors like

$$\omega_{o,c} = \sqrt{-1}\left(\frac{dz_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_1}{|z_1|^{2(1-\beta)}} + \sum_{i=2}^{n} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i\right).$$

Now we assume that $|z_1(p)| = |z_1(q)| = \epsilon, |z_i(p)|, |z_i(q)| \approx \epsilon$ where $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough and $2 \geq i \geq n$. First we choose the segment connecting p and q acrossing the point $o \in D$. By the estimate above we know that

$$d(p, o) + d(o, q) \approx \frac{2\epsilon^{\beta}}{\beta}.$$

On the other hand we choose a segment γ' whose projection on z_1 coordinate is almost a geodesic in the cone with angle β, by standard computation we know that

$$L(\gamma') \approx C\epsilon + 2\sin\frac{\pi\beta}{2}\frac{\epsilon^{\beta}}{\beta}.$$

As ϵ is small and $\beta < 1$, we conclude that the geodesic connecting p and q doesn't cross the point $o \in D$. In general case we only need to choose p', q' as the case above to replace p, q and connect p, p' and q, q' respectively then all the argument follows. As $M \setminus D$ is geodesically convex, by the C^2-estimate in (6.1) we can see that M is the metric completion of $M \setminus D$, moreover, the equivalence i extends to a Lipschitz map from (M, ω) onto $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$ (we still denote this map as i)and the Lipschitz constant is 1. What remains to do is to prove i is an isometry between (M, ω) and $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$. As $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$ is a metric completion of $M \setminus D$, we only to need to prove that for $p, q \in M \setminus D$,

$$d_{\omega}(p, q) = \bar{d}(i(p), i(q)).$$

First we observe that $\bar{D} = i(D)$ is the Gromov-Hausdorff limit of D under the convergence of (M, ω_{δ}) to $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$, whose Hausdorff measure is 0, by the C^2-estimate in (6.1). Now we only need to prove that for any $\bar{p}, \bar{q} \in \bar{M} \setminus \bar{D}$ there exists a minimizing geodesic $\gamma \subset \bar{M} \setminus \bar{D}$ joining $\bar{p}, \bar{q}$. If not, we will have

$$\bar{d}(\bar{p}, \bar{q}) < d_{\omega}(p, q),$$

where $\bar{p} = i(p), \bar{q} = i(q)$. Then there exists a small $r > 0$ such that:
(1)$B_r(\bar{p}, \bar{d}) \bigcap \bar{D} = \emptyset, B_r(\bar{q}, \bar{d}) \bigcap \bar{D} = \emptyset$, where $B_r(\cdot, \bar{d})$ is a geodesic ball in $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$;
(2)$\bar{d}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) < d_{\omega}(x, y)$, where $\bar{x} = i(x) \in B_r(\bar{p}, \bar{d})$ and $\bar{y} = i(y) \in B_r(\bar{q}, \bar{d})$. From these two we know that any minimizing geodesic γ connecting $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ intersects with $\bar{D}$. As $r > 0$ is small, and i is an isometry outside the divisor D, we have

$$B_r(\bar{p}, \bar{d}) = i(B_r(p, \omega)), \quad B_r(\bar{q}, \bar{d}) = i(B_r(q, \omega)).$$

Choosing a small tubular neighborhood T of D in M whose closure is disjoint from both $B_r(p, \omega)$ and $B_r(q, \omega)$. When the radius of such tubular is small enough we can make $Vol(\partial T)$ arbitrary small. Now we can choose $p_{\delta}, q_{\delta} \in M$ and neighborhood

T_δ of D with respect to ω_δ such that as $\delta \to 0$, $p_\delta, q_\delta, T_\delta$ converge to $\bar{p}, \bar{q}, i(T)$ in Gromov-Hausdorff topology. By volume convergence theorem of Colding,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0+} Vol(\partial T_\delta, \omega_\delta) = Vol(\partial T, \omega),$$

so $Vol(\partial T_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ can be also arbitrary small as $\delta \to 0$. Also by convergence, when δ is small enough, $B_r(p_\delta, \omega_\delta), B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ and T_δ are mutually disjoint. By (2), any minimizing geodesic γ_δ connecting any $w \in B_r(p_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ and $z \in B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ intersects with T_δ, Now we need an estimate due to Gromov:

Lemma 6.3. *$c(\mu) r^{2n} \leq Vol(B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta), \omega_\delta) \leq C(L, \mu, n, r) Vol(\partial T_\delta, \omega_\delta)$, where $L = \bar{d}(\bar{p}, \bar{q})$.*

Proof. The first inequality follows from the Ricci lower bound and Gromov's relative volume comparison theorem directly. For the second inequality, by Chap.9 in [11], we set $\lambda(t, \theta)$ as the volume density function where t is the distance from p_δ. We also set $\lambda_k(t, \theta)$ as the standard volume density function of the space form with constant curvature $k = \frac{\mu}{n-1}$. By the argument in [11] we know that the map

$$t \to \frac{\lambda(t, \theta)}{\lambda_k(t, \theta)}$$

is nonincreasing in t. In our case, we consider the geodesics from p_δ to $z \in B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta)$. According to the construction, we have $r < d(p_\delta, z_T) < d(p_\delta, z), L - r < d(p_\delta, z) < L + r$, where z_T is the intersection point of the geodesics from p_δ to z and ∂T_δ, and $L \approx d(p_{\delta)}, q_\delta)$. Along ∂T_δ, we have

$$\frac{\lambda(z_T)}{\lambda_k(z_T)} \geq \frac{\lambda(z)}{\lambda_k(z)}.$$

Let $S \in S^{2n-1}$ and $C(S)$ denote the part which all the geodesics from p_δ to $z \in B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ lie in and corresponding geodesic cone, and set $t(\theta)$ as the distance from p_δ to each point of ∂T_δ, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} Vol(\partial T_\delta) &\geq \int_{\partial T_\delta \bigcap C(S)} \lambda(t, \theta) = \int_S t^{2n-1}(\theta) \lambda(t, \theta) d\theta \\ &\geq \int_S \lambda(L') \frac{\lambda_k(t(\theta))}{\lambda_k(L')} t^{2n-1}(\theta) d\theta \geq C \int_S \lambda(L') L'^{2n-1} d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where $L - r < L' < L + r$. Now we take the integral of this inequality, we will have that

$$Vol(\partial T_\delta) \geq \frac{2C}{r} \int_{L-r}^{L+r} \int_S \lambda(L') L'^{2n-1} d\theta dt \geq C(L, \mu, n, r) Vol(B_r(q_\delta, \omega_\delta), \omega_\delta).$$

Then the lemma follows. □

As we have known that $Vol(\partial T_\delta, \omega_\delta)$ can be also arbitrary small asδ tends to 0, the lemma above leads to a contradiction. Then i can extend to a isometry from (M, ω) onto $(\bar{M}, \bar{d})$, and the theorem follows when D is irreducible. In case that D has a simple normal crossing, we only need to see that near the crossing point, we can project the geodesic to all directions and do similar analysis to these and the theorem still follows. □

References

[1] R. Berman, A thermodynamical formalism for Monge-Ampere equations, Moser-Trudinger inequalities and Kähler-Einstein metrics, arXiv:1011.3976.

[2] S. Brendle, Ricci flat Kähler metrics with edge singularities, arXiv:1103.5454v2.

[3] J. Cheeger, T. H. Colding and G. Tian, On the singularities of spaces with bounded Ricci curvature, Geom. Funct. Anal., 12 (2002), 873-914.

[4] X.X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun, Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, I: approximation of metrics with cone singularities, arXiv:1211.4566.

[5] X.X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun, Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, II: limits with cone angle less than 2, arXiv:1212.4714.

[6] X.X. Chen, S. Donaldson and S. Sun, Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, III: limits as cone angle approaches 2 and completion of the main proof, arXiv:1302.0282.

[7] W.Y. Ding, G. Tian, Kähler-Einstein metrics and the generalized Futaki invariants. Invent. Math., 110 (1992), 315-335.

[8] T. D. Jeffres, R. Mazzeo, Y. A. Rubinstein, Kähler-Einstein metrics with edge singularities, with an appendix by C. Li and Y. A. Rubinstein. arXiv:1105.5216.

[9] C. Li, Kähler-Einstein metrics and K-stability. Princeton thesis, May,2012.

[10] C. Li and S. Sun, Conic Kähler-Einstein metrics revisited. Preprint, arXiv:1207.5011.

[11] P. Petersen, Riemannian geometry, 2nd Ed, GTM171, Springer, 2006.

[12] G.Tian, On Kähler-Einstein metrics on certain Kähler Manifolds with $C_1(M) > 0$, Invent. Math., 89, 225-246 (1987)

[13] G.Tian, On Calabis conjecture for complex surfaces with positive first Chern class. Invent. Math. 101, (1990), 101-172.

[14] G.Tian, Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature. Invent. Math., 130 (1997), 1-39.

[15] G.Tian, Canonical Metrics on Kähler Manifolds. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, 2000.

[16] G. Tian, Existence of Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, Metric and Differential Geometry: The Jeff Cheeger Anniversary Volume, X. Dai and X. Rond edt., Prog. Math., volume 297 (2012), 119-159.

[17] G.Tian, K-stabilitiy and Kähler-Einstein metrics, arXiv:1211.4669

[18] S.T.Yau, On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampere equation. I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 31(1978), no. 3, 339411.

Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.
E-mail address: liangmin@math.princeton.edu